BELLSOUTH

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.

333 Commerce Street

Suite 2101

Nashville, TN 37201-3300

guy.hicks@bellsouth.com

• 10 11 23 PM 3 52 • 10 October 23, 2000

Guy M. Hicks General Counsel

615 214-6301 Fax 615 214-7406

VIA HAND DELIVERY

David Waddell, Executive Secretary Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, TN 37238

> Re: Generic Docket to Establish UNE Prices for Line Sharing per FCC 99-355 and Riser Cable and Terminating Wire as Ordered in TRA Docket

No. 98-00123

Docket No. 00-00544

Dear Mr. Waddell:

Enclosed are fourteen copies of BellSouth's responses to Sprint's First Set of Interrogatories and First Set of Requests for Production. Attachment No. 1 to BellSouth's response to Item No. 1 of Sprint's First Request for Production contains proprietary information and is being submitted under separate cover subject to the terms of the Protective Order entered in this proceeding.

Copies of the enclosed have been provided to counsel of record for all parties.

Very truly yours,

Guv M. Hicks

GMH:ch Enclosure



BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt No. 00-00544
Sprint's 1st Set of Interrogatories
October 13, 2000
Item No. 1
Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Does BellSouth allow for the line splitter to be directly wired from the splitter to the CLEC collocation area? If not, please explain why?

RESPONSE: No. In early discussions with the CLEC collaborative, this topic was met with mixed reviews. Some CLECs wanted hard-wired cabling between the DSLAM and the splitter, while others did not want to dedicate an entire 24-pair count to that purpose. The foremost reason that BellSouth did not chose this option was the fact that, when the splitter shelves are being installed by the turf vendor, BellSouth does not know which CLEC will be purchasing each shelf or portion of a shelf. After a CLEC orders their splitters in multiples of 24, the installation vendor would have to go back and install these cables, possibly working among other cables already carrying service. The same installation problem would exist in the future as one CLEC disconnects their 24-count and another requests a new 24-count, cables would have to be removed and installed accordingly, all done amidst the other cables carrying service. The necessity for the vendor to revisit each shelf before service could be established would also lengthen the splitter availability interval.

In addition, these proposed direct cables from the CLEC DSLAM to the splitter shelf could actually bypass the existing collocation rules and procedures. Existing collocation procedures dictate how a CLEC requests new collocation terminations when needed. Directly cabling from a collocation space to a BellSouth equipment lineup would need to follow those existing procedures.

BellSouth interfaces with the CLEC's data signal using the existing CLEC collocation termination arrangements, whether those are POT bays or frame appearances on the Toll MDF. From these previously established meet points, a cross-connect is run to the frame appearance of the splitter.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Set of Interrogatories October 13, 2000 Item No. 2 Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Reference page 001721, Line 28, of BellSouth's Supplemental cost study filed October 2, 2000 ("Cost Study"). Please explain why 4 connecting blocks are required?

RESPONSE: Four connecting blocks are used because each of the four 24-line groups in the 96-line splitter is dedicated to a connecting block.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Set of Interrogatories October 13, 2000 Item No. 3 Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Provide the manufacturer and product number of the Distribution Frame on line 10 on page 001721 of the Cost Study.

RESPONSE: The manufacturer for the frame is Lucent and the product ID is ED6C736-30 G-6.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Set of Interrogatories October 13, 2000 Item No. 4 Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Provide the manufacturer and product number for the Line Sharing splitter bay on line 36 on page 001721 of the Cost Study.

RESPONSE: The material cost for the Line Share Splitter Bay is considered Minor Material Components for the mounting of the bay. Included in the minor material is: lugnuts for bolting the equipment to the floor; frame grounding; lettering and numbering; 1/3 of lighting costs; 1/3 of cable racking costs; bay extenders; end guards; spacers; and, guard rails, as appropriate. BellSouth Installation vendors are required to procure these items. Therefore, BellSouth does not have the information requested.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Set of Interrogatories October 13, 2000 Item No. 5 Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Explain how the system capacity for the line sharing splitter bay of

8 (Page 001721, line 40 of the Cost Study) was determined?

RESPONSE: Based on the size of the bay, it has a capacity for 8 splitters with

each having a corresponding test shelf.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Set of Interrogatories October 13, 2000 Item No. 6 Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Reference page 001721, line 48 of the Cost Study. What

investment items are recovered with the input for Line Sharing

Splitter (Shelf, Test Equip, Plug-ins & Cabling)?

RESPONSE: The items recovered on line 48 line sharing splitter material are

the splitter, test access shelf, bay and connectorized cables.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt. No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Request for Production of Documents Item No. 1 Page 1 of 1

REQUEST:

On page 001721, line 48 of the Cost Study, please provide the cost study that relates to the input for Line Sharing Splitter (Shelf,

Test Equip, Plug-ins & Cabling).

RESPONSE: A cost study for the requested items does not exist. However, see Attachment No. 1 for the supporting document for these inputs. This document contains proprietary information and is subject to the provisions of the nondisclosure agreement

executed by Sprint.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt. No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Request for Production of Documents Item No. 2a Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Reference the Affidavit of Jerry Hendrix filed by BellSouth in this case on August 18, 2000 and Exhibit JH-1 attached thereto. On page 3 of 6 of Exhibit JH-1, source footnote 4 (as defined on page 6 of 6) references "Cost results filed on August 18, 2000 with the Florida Public Service Commission in Docket No. 99649-TP" as the source of several rates ("Florida Docket"). Please provide the following information as it relates to the Florida Docket:

a) Please provide the cost study referenced in the Florida Docket including all inputs, cost factors, models and all other information used to develop the rates.

RESPONSE: BellSouth objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information which is not relevant to the issues presented to the Authority in this proceeding. Moreover, BellSouth objects to this request because it is burdensome. In any event, (1) Sprint is already in possession of the requested information because Sprint was a party to the Florida docket; and (2) Mr. Hendrix's affidavit was submitted in connection with the Hearing Officer's order imposing interim rates and the affidavit has no bearing on the permanent rates to be established in this proceeding.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt. No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Request for Production of Documents Item No. 2b Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Reference the Affidavit of Jerry Hendrix filed by BellSouth in this case on August 18, 2000 and Exhibit JH-1 attached thereto. On page 3 of 6 of Exhibit JH-1, source footnote 4 (as defined on page 6 of 6) references "Cost results filed on August 18, 2000 with the Florida Public Service Commission in Docket No. 99649-TP" as the source of several rates ("Florida Docket"). Please provide the following information as it relates to the Florida Docket:

b) Please provide the questions and answers to all discovery issued to BellSouth in the Florida Docket regarding the cost study produced in response to item 2.a).

RESPONSE: BellSouth objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information which is not relevant to the issues presented to the Authority in this proceeding. Moreover, BellSouth objects to this request because it is burdensome. In any event, (1) Sprint is already in possession of the requested information because Sprint was a party to the Florida docket; and (2) Mr. Hendrix's affidavit was submitted in connection with the Hearing Officer's order imposing interim rates and the affidavit has no bearing on the permanent rates to be established in this proceeding.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt. No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Request for Production of Documents Item No. 2c Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Reference the Affidavit of Jerry Hendrix filed by BellSouth in this case on August 18, 2000 and Exhibit JH-1 attached thereto. On page 3 of 6 of Exhibit JH-1, source footnote 4 (as defined on page 6 of 6) references "Cost results filed on August 18, 2000 with the Florida Public Service Commission in Docket No. 99649-TP" as the source of several rates ("Florida Docket"). Please provide the following information as it relates to the Florida Docket:

c) Please provide any commission orders or decisions issued in the Florida Docket regarding the cost study produced in response to item 2.a).

RESPONSE: BellSouth objects to this request because it seeks the production of documents which are a matter of public record, therefore, equally available to Sprint. Moreover, Mr. Hendrix's affidavit was submitted in connection with the Hearing Officer's order imposing interim rates and the affidavit has no bearing on the permanent rates to be established in this proceeding.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt. No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Request for Production of Documents Item No. 2d Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Reference the Affidavit of Jerry Hendrix filed by BellSouth in this case on August 18, 2000 and Exhibit JH-1 attached thereto. On page 3 of 6 of Exhibit JH-1, source footnote 4 (as defined on page 6 of 6) references "Cost results filed on August 18, 2000 with the Florida Public Service Commission in Docket No. 99649-TP" as the source of several rates ("Florida Docket"). Please provide the following information as it relates to the Florida Docket:

d) If hearings in the Florida Docket have been completed, please provide the transcript from the hearings regarding the cost study produced in response to item 2.a).

RESPONSE: BellSouth objects to this request because it seeks the production of documents which are a matter of public record, therefore, equally available to Sprint. Moreover, Mr. Hendrix's affidavit was submitted in connection with the Hearing Officer's order imposing interim rates and the affidavit has no bearing on the permanent rates to be established in this proceeding.

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. TN TRA Dkt. No. 00-00544 Sprint's 1st Request for Production of Documents Item No. 2e Page 1 of 1

REQUEST: Reference the Affidavit of Jerry Hendrix filed by BellSouth in this case on August 18, 2000 and Exhibit JH-1 attached thereto. On page 3 of 6 of Exhibit JH-1, source footnote 4 (as defined on page 6 of 6) references "Cost results filed on August 18, 2000 with the Florida Public Service Commission in Docket No. 99649-TP" as the source of several rates ("Florida Docket"). Please provide the following information as it relates to the Florida Docket:

e) Please provide any direct, rebuttal, surebuttal, supplemental and any other type of testimony filed by BellSouth in the Florida Docket regarding the cost study produced in response to item 2.a).

RESPONSE: BellSouth objects to this request because it seeks the production of documents which are a matter of public record, therefore, equally available to Sprint. Moreover, Mr. Hendrix's affidavit was submitted in connection with the Hearing Officer's order imposing interim rates and the affidavit has no bearing on the permanent rates to be established in this proceeding.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 23, 2000, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the parties of record, via the method indicated:

[] Hand [] Mail [∕] Facsimile [] Overnight	Jon E. Hastings, Esquire Boult, Cummings, et al. P. O. Box 198062 Nashville, TN 37219-8062
[] Hand [] Mail [~] Facsimile [] Overnight	James Wright, Esq. United Telephone - Southeast 14111 Capitol Blvd. Wake Forest, NC 27587
[] Hand[] Mail[] Facsimile[] Overnight	Charles B. Welch, Esquire Farris, Mathews, et al. 205 Capitol Blvd, #303 Nashville, TN 37219
[] Hand[] Mail[] Facsimile[] Overnight	James Lamoureux, Esquire AT&T 1200 Peachtree St., NE Atlanta, GA 30309
[] Hand[] Mail[] Facsimile[] Overnight	T. G. Pappas, Esquire R. Dale Grimes, Esquire Bass, Berry & Sims 315 Deaderick Street Nashville, TN 37238
[] Hand[] Mail[] Facsimile[] Overnight	Henry Walker, Esquire Boult, Cummings, et al. 414 Union Ave., #1600 P. O. Box 198062 Nashville, TN 39219-8062
[] Hand [] Mail [] Facsimile [] Overnight	Joshua M. Bobeck, Esquire Swidler Berlin, et al. 3000 K St., NW, #300 Washington, DC 20007-5116

